

### **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in this application. Claims 2-3 have been canceled by this reply. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

#### **Acknowledgment of Priority Claim**

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge the claim for priority to French Application 0100037 filed on January 3, 2001. The priority document was submitted on June 3, 2002.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to more clearly recite the steps performed in the method and to recite that the updated information that is downloaded from the broadcast source is stored in both a cache memory and a buffer memory. Dependent claims 4-10 have been amended to clarify the language of the claims and correspond to amended independent claim 1. Support for the amendments made to claims 1 and 11 may be found, for example, in Figure 2 and paragraphs [0055] and [0058] of the Specification. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claims 3-7 and 9 are objected to for informalities. All the claims have been amended by this reply to clarify the language, correct typographical errors, and make the claims easier to understand. Claim 10 has been amended to clarify that MPEG stands for Motion Picture Experts Group. Briefly, MPEG is a specific type of standard used for coding audio-visual information (e.g., movies, video, music) in a digital compressed format. In view of the above, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,745,368 ("Boucher") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,404 ("Brotz"). Claim 2 has been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to claim 2. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention discloses a method and system for obtaining information for display on a television or other audio/visual device. Specifically, when a request for information is received, a determination is made about whether the requested information is present in the cache memory. If present in the cache memory, the information is then verified to ensure that the information is the most current audio/visual information. The verification process involves comparing a duration of validity associated with the information with an actual date (e.g., the current date, a predetermined date, etc.) to determine whether the information is valid or expired (*see* Specification, Figure 2 and paragraph [0054]). If the information is valid, then the information is loaded into the buffer memory for display. If the information is expired, or if the information is not present in the cache memory, then the information is downloaded from the broadcast source and associated with a new duration of validity. The information (affixed with

the new duration of validity) is stored in *both* the cache memory and the buffer memory for display (*see* Specification, Figure 2 and paragraph [0058]).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (*See* MPEP §2143.03). Further, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." (*See* MPEP §2143.03). The Applicant respectfully asserts that the references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of amended independent claim 1.

Particularly, Boucher fails to disclose or suggest storing updated information that is downloaded from a broadcast source in *two distinct buffer regions*, as recited in the amended claims. Boucher only teaches that the requested content is rendered and stored in a rendered cache memory (*see* Boucher, Figure 2, reference 201). However, Boucher is completely silent with respect to storing updated information in *both* a buffer memory associated with a processing unit that is to display the updated information and a cache memory. In fact, Boucher does not even disclose two distinct regions of memory. Boucher only discloses a cache memory. In addition, Boucher fails to disclose or suggest affixing a duration of validity to the updated information, as admitted by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action mailed March 22, 2006.

Further, Brotz fails to disclose that which Boucher lacks, as evidenced in part by the fact that the Examiner relies on Brotz solely for the purpose of disclosing a broadcast source (*see* Office Action mailed March 22, 2006, page 3). Brotz discloses searching a cache memory for a selected web page (*see* Brotz, Figure 5, Step 454 and accompanying text). However, Brotz fails to teach or suggest storing downloaded updated information from the broadcast source in

multiple memory regions, including a buffer memory associated with the processing unit that is to display the updated downloaded information and a cache memory.

In view of the above, it is clear that neither Boucher nor Brotz, whether considered separately or in combination, render the claimed invention obvious. Thus, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Boucher and Brotz. Dependent claims 6-10 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boucher in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,299 ("MacPhail"). Claim 3 has been canceled by this reply, thus this rejection is now moot with respect to claim 3. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Boucher fails to disclose the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Further, MacPhail fails to supply that which Boucher lacks. MacPhail relates to automatically managing the retention and deletion of documents stored in an interactive handling system (*see* MacPhail, Abstract). MacPhail fails to disclose or suggest storing updated information downloaded from a broadcast source in *both* a buffer memory and a cache memory. In fact, MacPhail only teaches one region of memory located within a processing unit (*see* MacPhail, Figure 2).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claim 1 is patentable over Boucher and MacPhail, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 4-5 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/040001).

Dated: May 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant